

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR 06/25/97 08/882,499 HUANG R 41060 Г EXAMINER HM22/0924 CUSHMAN DARBY & CUSHMAN MARX, I INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP OF PILLSBURY ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER MADISON & SUTRO 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE N W NINTH FLOOR EAST TOWER 1651 WASHINGTON DC 20005-3918 DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

09/24/99

PTO-90C (Rev. 2/95)

Application No. 08/882,499

Applicant(s)

...

Office Action Summary

Huang et al.

Group Art Unit

Examiner

Irene Marx 1651

X Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 8, 1999	
X This action is FINAL .	
Since this application is in condition for allowance except in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is so is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Fails application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Exte 37 CFR 1.136(a).	ure to respond within the period for response will cause the
Disposition of Claims	·
	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
Claim(s)	
iXi Claim(s) <u>5-7</u>	
Claim(s)	
	are subject to restriction or election requirement.
Application Papers	
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drav	ving Review, PTO-948.
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are obj	jected to by the Examiner.
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗖 approved 🗖 disapproved.
\square The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	•
\square The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	•
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign prior	ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copie	s of the priority documents have been
received.	
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial I	
received in this national stage application from t	the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*Certified copies not received: Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic pri	iority under 35 II S C 5 119(a)
	onty under 33 0.3.c. s 113(e).
Attachment(s)	
 Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Pape 	vr No(s)
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413	1140(5).
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTC	0-948
☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
SEE OFFICE ACTION O	ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES

Serial No. 08/882499 Art Unit 1651

The amendment filed 9/8/99 is acknowledged. Claims 5-7 are being considered on the merits.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 5-6 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 5,663,209. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent is drawn to a method of suppressing viral growth with substantially the same compounds as are used in the present invention.

Therefore, the claims are co-extensive.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims encompass an improper Markush grouping because of the recitation of "or". Conjunctive rather than alternative language should be used (e.g. selected from the group consisting of A,B, AND C). The claims as drafted do not follow this form.

See MPEP 2173.05(h)(a).

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being by clearly anticipated by Sinnott et al.. See, e.g. Example 3, wherein Sinnott et al. teaches the administration of a complex formulation comprising Larrea tridentata extracts. That Larrea tridentata comprises a variety of lignans having biological activity against viruses, including in particular also 3-O-methyl norhydroguaiaretic acid (Mal 4), is disclosed at col.2, lines 20-27. These compounds are inherently water soluble.

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicants argue that NDGA, having --OH substituents only, is now excluded from the claimed invention. However, the process of Sinnott *et al.* is not directed to the administration of NDGA *per se*, but rather to the administration of a complex formulation comprising *Larrea tridentata* extracts (See, e.g., Example 3). That *Larrea tridentata* comprises a variety of lignans having biological activity against viruses, including in particular also 3-O-methyl norhydroguaiaretic acid (Mal 4), is disclosed at col.2, lines 20-27. Moreover, the claims as written encompass unknown constituents by virtue of the recitation "pharmaceutically acceptable derivatives thereof". The nature of these "derivatives" is not clearly delineated.

Therefore the rejection is deemed proper and it is adhered to.

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irene Marx whose telephone number is (703) 308-2922.

Serial No. 08/882499 Art Unit 1651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn, can be reached on (703) 308-4743. The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

June Marx

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1651